REMARKS

In the Office Action[1], the Examiner objected to the specification; rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being drawn to non-statutory subject matter; rejected claims 1, 4-6, and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,096,257 to Trisno et al. ("*Trisno*"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,321 to Barrett ("*Barrett*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0169937 to Kagawa ("*Kagawa*"); rejected claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Trisno*, in view of *Barrett*, in view of *Kagawa*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,127,524 to Renda et al. ("*Renda*"); and rejected claims 3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Trisno*, in view of *Barrett*, in view of *Kagawa*, in view of *Renda*, and further in view of "Hypertext Transfer Protocol - HTTP/1.1" to Fielding et al. ("*Fielding*").

Applicants have amended the specification and claims 1-11. Claims 1-11 remain pending.

The Examiner indicated that the JP 3-123137, included in Applicants' IDS dated January 14, 2005 was not considered because a concise explanation of its relevance was not provided (Office Action at page 2). This document was cited in a search report for International Application No. PCT/JP2004/004919 during the international stage of this national stage application, and "the requirement for a concise explanation of relevance can be satisfied by submitting an English-language version of the search

---

[1] The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

report or action which indicates the degree of relevance found by the foreign office."
See M.P.E.P. § 609.04(a).

Applicants have attached an English-language version of the search report and submit that the search report for International Application No. PCT/JP2004/004919 meets these requirements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider this document and annotate the PTO 1449 form accordingly in the next Office Action.

Regarding the objection to the specification, the Examiner states, "[p]ages 20 and 24 contain the statement 'If the number of registered MAC addresses < the limit number of registration: N is not established'. In both cases, this is not consistent with the previous paragraph" (Office Action at page 2). Applicants have amended the specification to provide consistency. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the Examiner states, "claim 1 recites the clause, 'a MAC addresses of an access requesting client is registered until the number of said MAC address reaches a defined limit number of registration'" and this clause is unclear (Office Action at pages 2-3). In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, "one or more MAC addresses of an access requesting client are registered until the number of MAC addresses reaches a defined limit number of registration." Accordingly, the "access control section" may register "one or more MAC addresses of an access requesting client." Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Regarding the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §101, the Examiner states

that claim 11 is "directed to non-statutory subject matter" (Office Action at page 3).

Applicants respectfully disagree.

However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 11 to recite a

"[a] computer program, tangibly embodied in a computer-readable storage medium, for

executing an access control process in an information processing apparatus."

Accordingly, claim 11 positively recite a specific data structure that is <u>tangibly</u>

embedded in a computer-readable storage medium. Claim 11 thus falls squarely within

the categories of patentable subject matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request

reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, and 9-11 under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The prior art cited by the Examiner, *Trisno*, *Barrett*, and *Kagawa*,

does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 4-6, and 9-11. A *prima*

facie case of obviousness has, therefore, not been established.

Claim 1 recites an apparatus comprising, for example:

> . . .
> <u>a registration processing section for executing a setting change</u>
> <u>process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered</u>
> <u>client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered</u>
> <u>client MAC addresses in the MAC address table</u>,
> . . .

(emphasis added). The Examiner cites col. 2, lines 51-55 and col. 7, lines 32-37

of *Trisno* to disclose the claimed "registration processing section" (Office Action at

page 8). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Col. 2, lines 52-55 of *Trisno* discloses a node that "assigns a different network address to each of the nodes based on the unique identifier from the node." The Examiner states that this passage constitutes the claimed "automatically registered client MAC addresses" (Office Action at page 5). Col. 7, lines 32-34 of *Trisno* discloses, "the network addresses for one or more of the nodes are manually configured by a network administrator or other user." Examiner states that this passage constitutes the claimed "manually registered client MAC addresses" (Office Action at page 5).

Even assuming that this is correct, which Applicants do not concede, neither these passages or any other passage of *Trisno* teaches or suggests "a registration processing section" that executes "a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table." *Trisno* does not change an "entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table," as recited in claim 1.

Barrett does not cure the deficiencies of *Trisno*. *Barrett* discloses "a method of controlling access to a client computer connected to a network" (col. 3, lines 41-42). However, *Barrett* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, "a registration processing section for executing a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table," as recited in claim 1.

Kagawa does not cure the deficiencies of *Trisno* and *Barrett*. *Kagawa* discloses

providing "a table management method and device allowing efficient hash search with

suppressing the possibility of occurrence of rehashing" (paragraph 0010). *Kagawa*

does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example,

"a registration processing section for executing a setting change process for changing

an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry

of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address

table," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, *Trisno, Barrett,* and *Kagawa*, even if combined as suggested by the

Examiner, fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1, at

least because the references fail to teach each and every element of the claim. Claims

4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are thus also allowable over *Trisno, Barrett,* and

Kagawa, for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claims 6 and 11 and dependent claims 9 and 10 are allowable over

Trisno, Barrett, and *Kagawa* for at least the same reasons discussed above in regard to

claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of claims 2 and 7, dependent from claims 1 and 6,

respectively, the Examiner relies on *Renda* for allegedly disclosing "identifying the type

of said access request . . ." (Office Action at page 9). Even assuming this assertion is

correct, which Applicants do not concede, *Renda* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Trisno,*

Barrett, and *Kagawa* discussed above. *Renda* does not teach or suggest at least the

claimed combination of elements, including, for example, "a registration processing

section for executing a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more

automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table," as recited in independent claim 1, similarly recited in independent claim 6, and required by dependent claims 2 and 7. Therefore, claims 2 and 7 are also allowable over *Trisno*, *Barrett*, *Kagawa*, and *Renda*.

Regarding the rejection of claims 3 and 8, dependent from claims 1 and 6, respectively, the Examiner relies on *Fielding* for allegedly disclosing "HTTP-GET" (Office Action at page 11). Even assuming this assertion is correct, which Applicants do not concede, *Fielding* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Trisno*, *Barrett*, *Kagawa*, and *Renda* discussed above. *Fielding* does not teach or suggest at least the claimed combination of elements, including, for example, "a registration processing section for executing a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table," as recited in independent claim 1, similarly recited in independent claim 6, and required by dependent claims 3 and 8. Therefore, claims 3 and 8 are also allowable over *Trisno*, *Barrett*, *Kagawa*, *Renda*, and *Fielding*.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge

any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 5, 2008   By: /David W. Hill/
                                              David W. Hill
                                              Reg. No. 28,220